<u>REMARKS</u>

Claims 1-5 are now pending in the application. Applicant cancels claim 6 without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Regarding claim 1, the Examiner alleges that it "seems that that a first amplifier circuit and second amplifier circuit are mirror to one another," and therefore, "it is unclear why the first amplifier circuit supplies a current to an output terminal while the second amplifier circuit absorbs a current from the output terminal." However, as shown in Figure 1 and described in paragraphs [0024] and [0025], the first amplifier 10 and the second amplifier 20 receive different potentials V₁ and V₂, respectively. Further, the first amplifier 10 and the second amplifier 20 are operated according to different control signals PS1 bar and PS2, respectively. Therefore, while the amplifiers 10 and 20 are similar, they are not mirror images, and thusly can be understood to operate differently with respect to the output terminal. More specifically, the second amplifier 20 includes an n-channel transistor QN7 as shown in Figure 2 and described in paragraph [0030]. When signal PS2 is high, the transistor QN7 is "on," and therefore transistor QN6 is "off." In other words, the transistor QN7 is "absorbing" current from the output terminal.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner alleges that it is not clear which circuit is a "potential generating circuit." Referring to Figure 1, potentials V₁ and V₂ are generated according to resistors R1, R2, and R3, as well as potentials V_L and V_H. Therefore, it can be understood that the "potential generating circuit" of claim 2 refers to any suitable circuit that generates a first and second potential in the manner described in paragraph [0025].

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Itakura et al (U.S. Pat. No. 6,480,178). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner stated that claim 6 includes allowable subject matter and would be allowable if rewritten into independent form. Applicant amends claim 1 to include the allowable subject matter of claim 6. Itakura does not teach or disclose the subject matter of newly amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claim1, as well as its corresponding dependent claims, is now in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-5 depend from claim 1, which is now in condition for allowance.

Therefore, Applicant believes claims 2-5 are now in condition for allowance.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claim 6 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 6. Therefore, claims 1-5 should now be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7eh 28, 2005

G. Gregory Schivley Reg. No. 27/382

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C. P.O. Box 828 Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303 (248) 641-1600

GGS/DMA/lkj